



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/090,355

03/01/2002

Stephen F. Krempf

L7068-0001

3883

24350

7590

11/17/2005

STITES & HARBISON, PLLC
400 W MARKET ST
SUITE 1800
LOUISVILLE, KY 40202-3352

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/090,355	KREMPL, STEPHEN F.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeff Piziali	2673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,10,14,15 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,10,14,15 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 August 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 24 August 2005. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Recently amended claim 9 (as of the amendment submitted 24 August 2005) newly recites the subject matter of "each display screen includ[ing] an audio device for emitting audio signals." However, the original instant specification merely states, "audio signals may also be separated by the switch box for dissemination to a designated projection unit or a separate speaker system. The audio signals may be sent via the existing links 50, 70, 72, and 74 or through separate links" (see Page 10, Lines 11-14). The specification does not appear to disclose each display screen including an audio device, as claimed.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2673

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claim 20 newly (as of the amendment submitted 24 August 2005) recites the limitation "the operator" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 14, 15, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ludtke et al. (US 6,501,441).

Regarding claim 1, Ludtke discloses a system for presenting information, comprising: a computing system [Figs. 2 & 3; 22] which receives information [Fig. 2; 20] for presentation as inputted by an operator (see Column 8, Line 7 - Column 9, Line 40), the computing system formatting the information into a plurality of data packets (see Figs. 12-14), each data packet indicating a destination as selected and designated by the operator (see Column 17, Line 59 - Column 18, Line 47); a switch box [Fig. 3; 74] communicating with the computing system, the switch box receiving [Fig. 10; 304] the plurality of data packets sent from the computing system and determining [Fig. 10; 308] the destination of each data packet; and a plurality of display screens providing a display of information inputted into the computing system by the operator, the plurality of display screens [Fig. 2; 24-40] communicating with the switch box; whereby the switch box, upon determining the destination of each data packet, sends [Fig. 10; 320] the data packet to the designated display screen (see Column 15, Line 19 - Column 16, Line 53).

Regarding claim 2, Ludtke discloses each display screen includes a projection unit projecting a visual display onto the display screen (see Column 2, Lines 51-62).

Regarding claim 3, Ludtke discloses the plurality of display screens include three display screens [Fig. 2; 24, 26, and 28], each display screen providing a visual display of certain of the inputted information as selected and designated by the operator (see Column 8, Line 7 - Column 9, Line 40).

Regarding claim 4, Ludtke discloses the switch box includes a separation module for dividing [Fig. 10; 310] the plurality of data packets into arrays based on the destination selected and designated by the operator (see Column 15, Line 19 - Column 16, Line 53).

Regarding claim 5, Ludtke discloses the switch box includes a diversion module for determining [Fig. 10; 320] the destination for each data packet received from the computing system (see Column 15, Line 19 - Column 16, Line 53).

Regarding claim 6, Ludtke discloses the switch box is located within the computing system (see Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 7, Ludtke discloses a remote device [Fig. 2; 88 & 99] for operating the computing system (see Column 9, Lines 14-23).

Regarding claim 9, Ludtke discloses each display screen includes an audio device for emitting audio signals (see Column 23, Lines 1-8).

Regarding claim 10, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 9; furthermore; Ludtke discloses a plurality of audio devices for emitting audio signals (see Column 23, Lines 1-8).

Regarding claim 14, Ludtke discloses the switch box includes a means for converting [Fig. 10; 312] the plurality of data packets into image signals readable by the plurality of projection units, said switch box sending the image signals to the projection units of the display screens (see Column 15, Line 19 - Column 16, Line 53).

Regarding claim 15, Ludtke discloses the means for converting the plurality of data packets is at least one video card (see Column 8, Line 50 - Column 9, Line 4).

Regarding claim 17, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claims 1, 7, and 8; furthermore Ludtke discloses a method of presenting information on a plurality of display screens [Fig. 2; 24-40], comprising the steps of: inputting information [Fig. 2; 88 & 99], by an operator, into a computing system [Figs. 2 & 3; 22] for display to one of the plurality of display screens as selected by the operator (see Column 8, Line 7 - Column 9, Line 40); formatting the inputted information, by the computing system, into a plurality of data packets (see Figs. 12-14), each data packet indicating a destination of one of the display screens based on the selection of the operator (see Column 17, Line 59 - Column 18, Line 47); sending [Fig. 10; 304], by the computing system, the plurality of data packets to a switch box [Fig. 3; 74]; determining [Fig. 10; 320], by the switch box, the destination for each data packet to one of the plurality of display screens; sending, by the switch box, each data packet to the destination; and displaying, the information in the data packets to an audience (see Column 15, Line 19 - Column 16, Line 53).

Regarding claim 18, Ludtke discloses providing [Fig. 10; 308] an identification tag for each data packet to indicate the destination selected by the operator (see Column 15, Line 19 - Column 16, Line 53).

Regarding claim 19, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 4; furthermore Ludtke discloses separating [Fig. 10; 310] each data packet into a array based on the destination (see Column 15, Line 19 - Column 16, Line 53).

Regarding claim 20, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claims 1, 4, and 5; furthermore Ludtke discloses a system for presenting information, comprising: a computing system [Figs. 2 & 3; 22] which receives information [Fig. 2; 20] for presentation (see Column 8, Line 7 - Column 9, Line 40), the computing system formatting the information into a plurality of data packets (see Figs. 12-14), each data packet indicating a destination as selected and designated by the operator from the received information (see Column 17, Line 59 - Column 18, Line 47); a switch box [Fig. 3; 74] communicating with the computing system, the switch box receiving [Fig. 10; 304] the plurality of data packets sent from the computing system and determining [Fig. 10; 308] the destination of each data packet, the switch box including: a separation module for dividing [Fig. 10; 310] data packets into groups based on the designated destination, and a diversion module for determining [Fig. 10; 320] the designated destination for each data packet received from the computing system; and a plurality of display screens [Fig. 2; 24-40] for displaying information inputted into the computing system, the plurality of display screens communicating with the switch box; whereby the switch box,

Art Unit: 2673

upon determining the destination of each data packet, sends the data packet to the designated display screen (see Column 15, Line 19 - Column 16, Line 53).

Regarding claim 21, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claims 1, 7, 8, and 17; furthermore Ludtke discloses a method of presenting information on a plurality of display screens [Fig. 2; 24-40], comprising the steps of: inputting items of information [Fig. 2; 88 & 99] into a computing system [Figs. 2 & 3; 22]; selecting one of the plurality of display screens as a destination for the display of each item of information (see Column 8, Line 7 - Column 9, Line 40); formatting the items of information into a plurality of data packets (see Figs. 12-14), each data packet including an indication of the selected destination (see Column 17, Line 59 - Column 18, Line 47); sending [Fig. 10; 304] each data packet from the computing system to the selected destination; and displaying the information in the data packets on the display screens to an audience (see Column 15, Line 19 - Column 16, Line 53).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 24 August 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant contends the cited prior art of Ludtke et al. (US 6,501,441) neglects teaching an operator selecting and designating a destination for the display of each item of information (see Page 11 of the Amendment submitted 24 August 2005). However, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Ludtke first establishes, "A block diagram of an exemplary network of devices including a video source 20, a master device 22 and display devices 24-40 coupled together within an IEEE 1394-1995 serial bus network is illustrated in FIG. 2" (see Column 8, Lines 7-10). Then Ludtke states, "The master device 22 is preferably a stand-alone device through which a user has access and control of the IEEE 1394-1995 serial bus network. . . The master device 22 has the responsibilities of determining how the video stream is partitioned among the display devices 24-40 within the multiple display configuration and facilitating the partitioning of the video stream within the display devices 24-40" (see Column 8, Lines 40-49). And finally Ludtke teaches, "Preferably, the management support and controls for the multiple display configuration are exposed to control devices on the IEEE 1394-1995 serial bus network, allowing the control devices to issue commands to the master device concerning the configuration of the multiple display configuration. These commands allow the control device and the user, through the control device, to specify controls such as which display devices are to be used within the multiple display configuration, the configuration and orientation of the image on the multiple display configuration and other appropriate characteristics" (see Column 19, Lines 53-63).

While Ludtke teaches a system for semi-automated partitioning and scaling of a video stream, Ludtke also clearly discloses that the operator has control over the destination selection and designation functions of this system, as claimed. By such reasoning, rejection of the claims is deemed necessary, proper, and thereby maintained at this time.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2673

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-7678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



4 November 2005



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600